



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE USE OF μή WITH THE PARTICIPLE, WHERE THE NEGATIVE IS INFLUENCED BY THE CONSTRUCTION UPON WHICH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDS

BY GEORGE EDWIN HOWES

DURING the past year my attention has been called several times to the use of the negative μή with participles where the force of the participle would seem to demand οὐ; e. g. Xen. *An.* 4, 3, 28, κελεύει αὐτοῦ μέναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ μὴ διαβάοντας. Id. *Cyr.* 1, 2, 7, ὃν ἂν γνῶσι δυνάμενον μὲν χάριν ἀποδιδόναι, μὴ ἀποδιδόντα δέ, κολάζουσι. Plato, *Apol.* 29 A, τὸ . . . θάνατον δεδιέναι οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ δοκεῖν σοφὸν εἶναι μὴ ὄντα. Dem. 4, 15, οἶμαι τοίνυν ἐγὼ ταῦτα λέγειν ἔχειν, μὴ κωλύων εἴ τις ἄλλος ἐπαγγέλλεται τι. Editors generally pass over such places without any comment. Occasionally, however, an editor calls attention to the fact that the preceding construction has influenced the selection of the negative. The general rule is thus stated in Hadley-Allen's *Grammar* (1884), § 1027,—"μή is often used instead of οὐ with participles or other words, through an influence of the verbs on which they depend, when these verbs either have μή, or would have it, if negative." I have been curious enough to examine into the matter somewhat, to find whether such cases are common or only rarely found.¹ I have carried my search only down through the writers who flourished in whole or in part before 400 B.C. The investigation has not been exhaustive, even with the field thus limited. To secure every example would have necessitated a careful reading of all the authors included in this period. I have, however, looked through all the works of these authors, with the exception of Homer, gathering all the examples that attracted my eye. I may hope, therefore, to have a fairly representative, though not absolutely complete, list of examples. Naturally, I have not included those participles with μή that express condition, nor have I made a list of those instances that show

¹ There is said to be only one instance of the use of μή with the participle in Homer; cf. *Monro, Homeric Grammar*, § 361.

the generic use of μή, for the negative in both these cases is due, not to the influence of any verb on which the participle depends, but to the force of the participle itself.¹

I. μή WITH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDENT UPON AN INDICATIVE.

1. Dependent upon ὅπως with the Independent Future Indicative of Exhortation.

Eur. *H. F.* 505: τοῦτον (sc. βίον) δ' ὅπως ἥδιστα διαπεράσετε ἐξ ἡμέρας εἰς νύκτα μὴ λυπούμενοι.

2. Dependent upon an Indicative of Purpose.

Soph. *O. R.* 1389: οὐκ ἂν ἐσχόμην τὸ μὴ ἀποκλῆσαι τοῦμὸν αἰθλιον δέμας, ἵν' ἡ τυφλὸς τε καὶ κλύων μὴδέν.

3. Dependent upon an Indicative Denoting Condition.²

Soph. *O. R.* 1110³: εἰ χρή τι κάμει μὴ συναλλάξαντά πω, πρέσβεις, σταθμᾶσθαι. Hdt. 7, 50: εἰ τοίνυν . . . οἱ . . . βασιλεῖς γνώμησι ἐχρέωντο ὁμοίησι καὶ σύ, ἡ μὴ χρεώμενοι . . . ἄλλους συμβούλους εἶχον τοιούτους . . . 7, 139. Eur. *Suppl.* 254.⁴

4. Dependent upon an Indicative with a Conditional Relative.

Aeschyl. *Serf.* 3: χρή λέγειν τὰ καίρια ὅστις φυλάσσει πρᾶγος ἐν πρῦμνῃ πόλεως οἶακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν ὕπνῳ. Eur. *Tr.* 1166; *Fr.* 503; *Fr.* 1049; Hdt. 7, 132; Thuc. 8, 74, 3.

5. Dependent upon an Indicative of Unattained Wish.

Eur. *Alc.* 536: εἴθ' εὖρομέν σ', Ἀδμητε, μὴ λυπούμενον. *Or.* 1580.

¹ As most of the passages referred to in this article are merely cited and not quoted in full I mention the editions used: *Hesiod*, Kzach; *Homeric Hymns*, Abel; *Ægeiac poets* (including *Theognis*), Bergk-Hiller; *Aeschylus*, Wecklein; *Sophocles*, Dindorf; *Euripides*, Kirchhoff; *Frag. Trag.*, Nauck; *Aristophanes*, Meineke; *Herodotus*, Stein; *Thucydides*, Classen; *Antiphon* and *Andocides*, Blass.

² I have noted two instances in which the negative is οὐ.

Soph. *O. R.* 885: εἰ δέ τις ὑπέροπτα χερσὶν ἡ λόγῳ πορεύεται, δικας ἀφύβητος οὐδὲ δαιμόνων ἔδη σέβων, κακὰ νιν ἔλοιτο μοῖρα. Eur. *Fr.* 450.

In the first example the presence of an intervening adjective — and that, too, a negative one — may sufficiently weaken the influence of the condition to make the negative οὐδὲ natural. In the second example the negative and the participle οὐσαν express a simple idea, "dead," and hence οὐκέτ' is normal.

³ Here there is the double influence of the condition εἰ χρή and of the infinitive σταθμᾶσθαι; cf. *infra*, p. 284, 3. In Eur. *Hercl.* 167 μὴ is generic.

⁴ Here the participle is really in indirect discourse; cf. p. 280, note 3.

II. μή WITH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDENT UPON A SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. Dependent upon a Hortatory Subjunctive.

Tyrt. 8, 14: *περὶ παίδων θνήσκωμεν ψυχῶν μηκέτι φειδόμενοι*.
Theog. 764; Eur. *H. F.*¹ 1110.

2. Dependent upon a Prohibitive Subjunctive.

Antiphon, 3, 8, 10²: *μήτε οὖν ἡμᾶς εἰς μὴ προσηκούσας συμφορὰς ἐμβάλῃτε*.

3. Dependent upon an Interrogative Subjunctive of Appeal.³

Theog. 913: *δύ' εἰσὶν πρόσθεν ὁδοί μοι· φροντίζω τούτων ἧντιν' ἴω προτέρην· ἢ μηδὲν δαπανῶν τρύχω βίον ἐν κακότητι, ἢ ζῶω . . .* Aeschyl. *Ag.* 777.

4. Dependent upon a Subjunctive of Purpose.⁴

Soph. *O. C.* 1279: *πειράσας' ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς γε κινῆσαι πατὸς τὸ . . . στόμα, ὥς μὴ μ' ἄτιμον . . . οὕτως ἀφῇ με, μηδὲν ἀντειπῶν ἔπος*.
Hdt. 9, 45 (*fin.*)⁵.

5. Dependent upon a Subjunctive with μή after a Verb of Fearing.

I have not found an example of this.⁶

¹ Though the verb is not expressed, it is felt as a hortatory subjunctive from the preceding verse, where there is an interrogative subjunctive of appeal.

² Perhaps μή is felt as generic.

³ In Eur. *I. A.* 384 the μή is generic and in Ar. *Ran.* 128, though an interrogative subjunctive of appeal just precedes, I think that an imperative is really felt in the answer; cf. *infra*, p. 281, IV.

⁴ Sometimes οὐ not μή is found with the participle after a subjunctive of purpose. The reason is that some stronger influence is at work to induce οὐ than to induce μή. The examples that I have noted are these:

Eur. *Phoen.* 1319: *ἐγὼ δ' ἤκω μετὰ γέρον ἀδελφὴν γραῖαν Ἰοκάστην, ὅπως λούσῃ προῆται τ' οὐκέτ' ὄντα παῖδ' ἐμὸν*. Here οὐκέτ' ὄντα — as in οὐ φημι — forms really one thought, i. e. "dead," cf. *supra*, p. 278, note 2.

⁵ Thuc. 3, 74, 2: Here the purpose clause, though immediately preceding the participle, is felt as parenthetical, and besides, the participle belongs to the preceding indicative clause.

In Thuc. 6, 91, 4 and in Andoc. 1, 31 the μή is generic; and in Aeschyl. *P. V.* 850 the μή is used with an indirect discourse participle dependent upon οἶδα in a purpose clause (*ὅπως δ' ἂν εἰδῇ μὴ μάτην κλύουσά μου*). The μή may be due to the purpose clause. But οἶδα often takes μή with the participle; cf. *infra*, p. 281. In Thuc. 8, 45, 2 (*fin.*) MSS. vary between οὐ and μή, and some omit the negative altogether.

⁶ I have noted two instances of the use of οὐ with the participle, though μή and

6. Dependent upon a Subjunctive denoting Condition.

Soph. *Tr.* 411:¹ ποῖαν ἀξίους δοῦναι δίκην, ἣν εὐρεθῆς ἐς τήνδε μὴ δίκαιος ὢν; Eur. *Or.* 1198; Ar. *Vesp.* 1119; *Pl.* 494; Hdt. 3, 69.²

7. Dependent upon a Subjunctive with a Conditional Relative or Temporal Word.³

Soph. *O. R.* 1530: ὥστε θνητὸν ὄντα . . . μὴδὲν ὀλβίζειν, πρὶν ἂν τέρμα τοῦ βίου περάσῃ μὴδὲν ἀλγεινὸν παθῶν. Critias, *Fr.* 4 (Nauck); Ar. *Nub.* 619.

III. μὴ WITH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDENT UPON AN OPTATIVE.

1. Dependent upon an Optative of Wish.⁴

Hom. *Od.* 4, 684: μὴ μνηστεύσαντες μὴδ' ἄλλοθ' ὀμλήσαντες ὕστατα καὶ πύματα νῦν ἐνθάδε δειπνήσειαν. Hes. *O. et D.* 444:⁵ τεσσαρακονταετῆς αἰζῆρος ἔπιτο . . . ὅς ἔργου μελετῶν ἰθεῖάν κ' αἴλακ' ἐλαύνει,

the subjunctive after an expression or implication of fear preceded. — Thuc. 4, 22, 3: ὁρῶντες δὲ αἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὔτε σφίσιν οἶόν τε ὅν ἐν πλήθει εἰπεῖν, εἰ τι . . . ἐδόκει αὐτοῖς ἐνυχωρεῖν, μὴ ἐς τοὺς ξυμμάχους διαβληθῶσιν εἰπόντες καὶ οὐ τυχόντες . . . ἀνχώρησαν. Though no verb of fear is expressed, fear is implied in the whole context, especially in the words οὔτε . . . εἰπεῖν. οὐ τυχόντες, however, is really equivalent to a single word ἀτυχοῦντες, and hence the negative οὐ and not μὴ. In Thuc. 5, 40, 3 though the negatived participle immediately follows the subjunctive, it belongs to the indicative that follows, and the preceding subjunctive is felt to have no influence over it at all.

¹ Here the participle is really in indirect discourse.

² The negative may be due to the fact that the participle is in indirect discourse (after φαίρηται), which is sometimes negatived by μὴ even when introduced by an indicative. Cf. Goodwin, *M. T.* 688.

³ I have not included Soph. *Ph.* 903, where the μὴ is generic. I have noted these instances where the negative is οὐ.

Theog. 750: τίς δὲ κεν βροτὸς ἄλλος . . . ἀξιοῖτ' ἀθανάτους, . . . ὀππότ' ἀνὴρ ἀδικος . . . οὔτε τευ ἀνδρὸς οὔτε τευ ἀθανάτων μῆνιν ἀλευόμενος, ὑβρίσῃ πλοῦτῳ κεκορημένος. Here the use of οὐ emphasizes the *fact*.

Aeschyl. *Ag.* 13: Here οὐκ ἐπισκοπούμενην suggests a simple idea, 'unvisited.'

⁴ In Aeschyl. *Ag.* 615 οὐ, not μὴ, follows an optative of wish. However, οὐδὲν διαφθείρασαν is equivalent to σφύζουσαν.

⁵ Here the participle immediately follows what appears to be a potential optative. There is considerable doubt, however, whether κ' should be read in the verse, which without κ' would be optative by assimilation due to the preceding optative of wish.

μηκέτι παπταίνων μεθ' ὁμήλικας. *Ibid.* 489; *Ibid.* 591; Theog. 1154¹; Eur. *I. T.* 535; *Ion* 632; *Frags.* 201; Ar. *Pl.* 892.

2. Dependent upon an Optative of Purpose.²

Thuc. 4, 67, 3: κομίσαντες (sc. ἀκάτιον ἀμφηρικόν) ἐς τὸ τεῖχος κατὰ τὰς πύλας ἐσῆγον, ὅπως τοῖς ἐκ τῆς Μινώας Ἀθηναίοις ἀφανῆς δὴ εἴη ἡ φυλακή, μὴ ὄντος ἐν τῷ λιμένι πλοίου φανεροῦ μηδενός.

3. Dependent upon an Optative denoting Condition.

Eur. *And.* 845: ἀλλ' εἰ σ' ἀφείην μὴ φρονοῦσαν, ὥς θάνοις; Or. 1174; *Tro.* 874; Ar. *Lys.* 1113; Antiphon, 1, 10; 6, 19; Hdt. 6, 130.³

4. Dependent upon an Optative with a Conditional Relative.

Theog. 734: εἴθε γένοιτο θεοῖς φίλα τοῖς μὲν ἀλιτροῖς ὕβριν ἀδεῖν, καὶ σφιν τοῦτο γένοιτο φίλον θυμῷ, σχέτλια ἔργα μετὰ φρεσ(ιν) ὅστις (ἀπ)ηγῆς ἐργάζοιτο, θεῶν μηδὲν ὑπὲζόμενος.

IV. μή WITH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDENT UPON AN IMPERATIVE.⁴

Tyrt. 13, 5: "Ἄγετ', ὦ Σπάρτας εὐάνδρω . . . λαίᾳ μὲν ἵπυν προβάλεσθε, δόρυ δ' εὐτόλμως (ἄνσχεσθε) μὴ φειδόμενοι τῆς ζωᾶς. Theog.

¹ Here there is a double influence, that of the optative εἴη and that of the infinitive ζῶειν. Cf. *infra*, p. 284, 3.

² I have noted two instances of a negative οὐ with the participle after an optative of purpose. — Eur. *Bacch.* 1050: ποιητὸν ἵζομεν νάπος, τὰ τ' ἐκ ποδῶν σιγηλὰ καὶ γλώσσης ἀπο σφύζοντες, ὥς ὀφῶμεν οὐχ ὀρώμενοι. Here οὐχ ὀρώμενοι is really thought of as one word, i. e. equivalent to ἀφανείς. Hdt. 1, 99. In this passage οὐ is used, instead of μή, to emphasize the *fact*, I think.

³ The clause μήτ' . . . ἀποδοκιμάζων depends intimately upon the protasis εἰ . . . εἴη, in spite of the intervening apodosis, and hence the negative μή.

⁴ I have not included examples in which the μή is generic, and hence may be used regardless of the imperative construction: e. g. Aeschyl. *P. V.* 44; *Cho.* 929; Soph. *O. C.* 1104; Eur. *Frags.* 362 (vs. 18); Ar. *Ecl.* 579; Hdt. 9, 98 (*fin.*); Thuc. 6, 40, 2.

There are many indirect discourse participles negated by μή which depend upon an imperative. — Aeschyl. *Pers.* 438 (after ἴσθι); *Ag.* 923 (after ἴσθι); Soph. *Ant.* 1063 (after ἴσθι, with ὥς); *Phil.* 253 (after ἴσθι, with ὥς — possibly generic); Eur. *And.* 726 (after ἴστε); *Herac.* 983 (after ἴσθι); *Hipp.* 306 (after ἴσθι); Hdt. 8, 144 (after ἐπίστασθε); Thuc. 1, 141, 1 (after διανοήητε — a disputed passage). As the negative μή is occasionally found with indirect discourse participles even after an indicative, I have not included these cases just cited, among those in which the negative μή is induced by the preceding imperative. Still, the influence of the imperative is something.

332; *Ibid.* 364; Aeschyl. *Suppl.* 81¹; *Ibid.* 215; *Ag.* 897; Soph. *El.* 1014¹; *O. C.* 489; *Ibid.* 1155; *Ant.* 1061; *Ph.* 415²; Eur. *Alc.* 1094³; *Hec.* 874; *Heracl.* 175; *I. A.* 818; *Or.* 657; *Tro.* 728; *Phoen.* 1234; *Frgt.* 288 (vs. 4); *Frgt.* 779; Ar. *Ran.* 128⁴; Hdt. 7, 10, 8⁵; Thuc. 1, 124, 2; 2, 87, 8; 3, 40, 7; 3, 48, 1⁶; 7, 15, 1 (*bis*).

οὐ WITH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDENT UPON AN IMPERATIVE.

There are so many of these cases in which οὐ is found with the Participle after the Imperative, that they are entitled to some consideration. I will note them first, and then consider them.

1 Theog. 468: μηδὲ θύραζε κέλευ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντ' ἰέναι. 2 Aeschyl. *Sept.* 699. 3 Soph. *Ant.* 1322. 4 Eur. *And.* 894. 5 *Hec.* 517. 6 *El.* 952. 7 *Heracl.* 773. 8 *I. T.* 802. 9 *Ion* 1324. 10 *Med.* 1311. 11 [*Rhes.*] 145. 12 Ar. *Nub.* 1123. 13 Hdt. 1, 91 (*med.*). 14 *Ibid.* 5, 92, η (*fin.*). 15 *Ibid.* 7, 10, η (*med.*). 16 *Ibid.* 7, 49 (*med.*).

Two of the participles (2, 5) are used with καίπερ. The influence of καίπερ (suggesting a fact) upon the negative is evidently stronger than that of the imperative. A third (9) has περ which does service for καίπερ.

In several cases the negative forms with the participle a simple idea: οὐκ ἐθέλοντ' (1) is equivalent to 'unwilling' or 'refusing.' So strong became the bond between οὐ and ἐθέλων that we find οὐ θελούσης equivalent to a condition; cf. Eur. *And.* 382: ἦν θάνης σύ, πᾶς ὁδ' ἐκφεύγει μόνον, σοῦ δ' οὐ θελούσης κατθανεῖν, τόνδε κτενῶ. Again, οὐκ ὄντα (3) means 'dead' and οὐκ ὄντα μᾶλλον ἢ means 'just as dead as.' Again, οὐδὲν εἰδώς (6) means 'ignorant.' In οὐ δοκοῦσ'

¹ The presence of an infinitive in these examples may make the influence for μηδὲ stronger than the simple imperative would. Cf. *infra*, p. 284, 3.

² Possibly generic.

³ Here an imperative is felt from αἰνῶ in the verse above.

⁴ From the interrogative subjunctive of appeal in the verse above, an imperative is felt, I think. Cf. *supra*, p. 279, note 3.

⁵ There is the influence both of the imperative, βούλευ and of the infinitive ἀπικέσθαι; cf. *infra*, p. 284, 3.

⁶ Though the participle precedes the imperative, the influence of the coming imperative is felt.

(8) we have a case parallel to οὐ φημι, where the negative really goes with the following infinitive. So οὐκ εἶ (4) means 'poorly' (κακῶς); and οὐ δικάϊως (7) means 'unjustly.' In these last two cases the negative really belongs to the adverb rather than to the participle, and, strictly speaking, these two should not be included in the list.

In one case (12) the participle depends more intimately upon a preceding indicative than upon the imperative which precedes that.

In Herodotus I note four instances (13, 14, 15, 16) of the negative οὐ with the participle, though the participle depends upon an imperative. In two of them (13, 16) the negative comes several words ahead of the imperative, and perhaps the imperative is not felt at all at the time the negative is used. In the third instance (15) the presence of οὐ instead of μή may help to emphasize the *fact*. In one case, however, (14) I find the negative οὐ even after the imperative ἴστε, though even the indicative of this verb sometimes takes μή with the participle. The fact that sometimes οὐ and sometimes μή is used with the participle after this verb may have weakened its influence, even in the imperative. Still, though we have perhaps too few cases to generalize safely, it would appear that in Herodotus the influence of the imperative in inducing the negative μή is weaker than in other authors.

V. μή WITH THE PARTICIPLE DEPENDENT UPON AN INFINITIVE.

1. Dependent upon an Infinitive used as an Imperative.

Hes. *O. et D.* 696: 'Ωραῖος δὲ γυναῖκα τέον ποτὶ οἶκον ἄγεσθαι, μήτε τριηκόντων ἐτέων μάλα πύλλ' ἀπολείπων μήτ' ἐπιθεὶς μάλα πολλά. *Hymn. Hom.* 3, 92.¹

2. Dependent upon an Infinitive used in an Exclamation.

Ar. *Nub.* 268: τὸ δὲ μηδὲ κυνὴν οἴκοθεν ἐλθεῖν ἐμὲ τὸν κακοδαίμον' ἔχοντα.

3. Dependent upon a Subjective or Objective Infinitive, not in Indirect Discourse.²

¹ As there is a lacuna before this verse, the construction of the infinitive εἶναι cannot be positively determined.

² I have not included examples where the μή is generic, and hence may be used regardless of the influence of the infinitive; e. g. Aeschyl. *Cho.* 749; *Eum.* 492 (reading doubtful), 699; Soph. *Ant.* 33 (after indirect discourse infinitive); Eur.

Theog. 280: Εἰκὸς τὸν κακὸν ἄνδρα κακῶς τὰ δίκαια νομίζειν, μη-
 δεμίαν κατέπιπθ' ἄζόμενον νόμοισιν. *Ibid.* 1154¹; Aeschyl. *Suppl.* 414;
Eum. 301; Soph. *Aj.* 261; *Ibid.* 1007; *El.* 1014²; *O. R.* 1110³;
O. C. 1509; *Ant.* 579; Eur. *Hel.* 814; *Ibid.* 1052; *Ibid.* 1289⁴;
Heracl. 533; *Ibid.* 693; *H. F.* 203; *I. T.* 1288; *Cycl.* 165⁵; *Med.*
 239; *Ibid.* 815; *Frgt.* 950; Ar. *Eq.* 766; *Ibid.* 905; *Nub.* 777⁶;
Ibid. 966; *Lys.* 474; *Eccles.* 284; *Pl.* 552; *Ibid.* 803; Hdt. 1, 80
 (med.); 5, 18 (fin.); 7, 10, 8⁷; 7, 24; 7, 101; 9, 41 (med.);
 Thuc. 1, 82, 1; 1, 90, 3; 1, 120, 2 (fin.); 3, 11, 1; 3, 39, 5 (init.);
 3, 43, 3; 3, 59, 1 (bis); 4, 38, 3; 4, 118, 4 (ter); 6, 36, 4; 6, 70, 1;
 6, 84, 1; 7, 77, 7; 8, 14, 1; 8, 27, 3; 8, 68, 4; Antiphon 2, a, 8;
 4, a, 1; 5, 18; Andoc. 1, 58; 1, 113.

The number of instances in which the negative οὐ is used with the
 participle dependent upon an infinitive is so great that I ought to treat
 them at length; but it would take more space to do so than is at my
 command. So I will refer to them — some thirty or so — and indicate
 what influences I think were at work to produce οὐ instead of μή.

In some instances the negative and the participle form a single idea,
 as in Theog. 1094 (οὐκ ἐθέλοντα); Soph. *O. C.* 934 (οὐχ ἐκῶν); Eur.
Ion 272 (οὐχ ὀρώμενον); *I. T.* 1344 (οὐκ ἐωμένοις); Hdt. 1, 11 (οὐ
 νομίζόμενα); Thuc. 6, 9, 1 (οὐ προσήκοντα); 8, 104, 4 (οὐχ ἐκῶν);
 Antiphon 5, 2 (οὐ προσηκούσης).

Hec. 984; *Hel.* 433, 923 (participle understood); *Hipp.* 922, 942, 997; *Or.* 1128;
Ph. 394; *Frgt.* 899; Achaëus, *Frgt.* 45; Ar. *Eccles.* 283; Thuc. 1, 32, 1; 1, 120, 2
 (init.); 2, 61, 4 (fin.); 3, 39, 5 (fin.); 3, 42, 5 (fin.); 4, 87, 4; 4, 98, 7
 (after indirect discourse infinitive); 5, 27, 2 (after indirect discourse infinitive) 6,
 56, 3 (in indirect discourse); 7, 43, 7; 7, 63, 3; Andoc. 1, 22, 32, 136; 4, 37.

¹ Here there is a double influence, that of the optative εἴη and that of the infini-
 tive ζῶειν. Cf. *supra*, p. 280, 1.

² Here there is a double influence, that of the imperative σκέε and that of the
 infinitive εἰκαθεῖν. Cf. *supra*, p. 281, IV.

³ Here there is a double influence of the condition εἰ χρή and of the infinitive
 σταθμᾶσθαι depending upon it. Cf. p. 278, 3.

⁴ Possibly generic.

⁵ μή added by conjecture of Hartung.

⁶ Here, if μέλλων is felt as implying a condition, we have a double influence, that
 of the condition, and that of the infinitive ὀφλίσκειν.

⁷ Here there is the double influence of the imperative βούλεν and of the infinitive
 ἀπικέσθαι. Cf. *supra*, p. 281, IV.

Several passages show ὥς with the participle: Hdt. 9, 122; Thuc. 3, 4, 4; 3, 37, 4; 7, 31, 4; 8, 63, 4; Antiphon 5, 32.

In several cases the infinitive depends on ὥστε: Eur. *Frgt.* 578; Hdt. 3, 14 (*med.*); 8, 52; Thuc. 4, 125, 1; 5, 49, 1 (after infinitive with ὥστε μή—the participle really depends upon the preceding indicative).

Perhaps the best explanation of the use of οὐ, instead of μή, in the remaining cases is that the author wishes thereby to emphasize the *fact*, as in Eur. *Hec.* 961; *El.* 46; *Heracl.* 897; *Suppl.* 472; Ar. *Achar.* 681; Hdt. 4, 30; 6, 103 (*med.*); 6, 106; 6, 117; 9, 116 (*med.*); Thuc. 1, 10, 4 (*fin.*); 8, 50, 3; Antiphon 5, 63; Andoc. 3, 35.

As this paper is concerned principally with the negative μή as induced by a neighboring construction, I have not listed the participles negated by οὐ when depending on an indirect discourse infinitive. For, since οὐ is the natural negative for an ordinary participle, and since οὐ is the natural negative for an indirect discourse infinitive, after such infinitive we should expect a participle, if negated, to have οὐ. I have noted about fifty such instances, and there are probably many more. I have not found any instances of the use of μή in this construction.¹

There are two examples of the use of μή with the participle that I have not been able to account for.

Aeschyl. *Sept.* 423: τίς ἄνδρα κομπάζοντα μή τρέσας μενεί; Is the negative μή to be accounted for on the supposition that the whole question has a characteristic or generic force? "Who is there that has the courage to await the boaster without trembling?"

Eur. *Frgt.* 196: τί δῆτ' ἐν ὀλβῳ μή σφεῖ βεβηκότες οὐ ζῶμεν ὥς ἥδιστα μή λυπούμενοι.

Is characteristic implied in this last example also? or is this verse but an echo of Eur. *H. F.* 505, quoted on page 278, 1?

This list of passages, even though incomplete, in which the negative μή with the participle is induced by its environment, may lead us to think twice before stating that in a given sentence a participle, merely because it has the negative μή, has necessarily a conditional force—a principle laid down in many of our grammars.

¹ In two cases after a verb or expression of swearing, followed by the infinitive, the participle depending upon the infinitive is negated by μή, as we should expect: Eur. *J. T.* 739; Ar. *Vesp.* 1281.